Transcription ICANN Singapore
GNSO Wrap Up
Thursday 12 February 2015
12:00-13:30 SGT

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.
On page: http://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#feb

Jonathan Robinson: All right, everyone, let's call this meeting to order. I'm sure you've all got things you could be getting on with so let's see if we can make a good session. We've got normally an hour and a half to work with. Let's see if we can do it in shorter and get you on your way to whatever else you need to be getting on with.

We've prepared a list with the help of Marika and Glen of action items or wrap up points to work through. So I don't - have you got control of the slides, Marika? Oh, Lars, thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: Okay the format is a bit strange. Okay. Yeah, all right. Okay I just wonder about this order. All right, let's go through these. We'll work through these. So can I have all of you all attention?

So the first item deals with the meetings we've just been through. These are ICANN 52 and related meetings. Any feedback or comment or input? And

there will be a survey coming out as usual. And so any feedback on the meetings, structure, content, value and so on?

Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: I guess this goes a little bit back to the point that Tony Holmes made who was frustrated to having been forced to listen to my CCWG update a couple of times. As we presented our progress to the various groups and met this morning to hear feedback from the various groups there was actually substantive feedback on where we are but there's no such feedback from the GNSO.

So I was wondering whether it is possible or desired for the GNSO Council to have a response through the GNSO Council on the progress made so far to give sort of a test of waters or some temperature in the room type feedback to both cross community working groups.

So I'm not sure whether, you know, since this was a ccNSO and GNSO and other groups matter whether it's desired that we, as a council, speak to this. But I felt like I was almost the only one not being able to provide substantive feedback.

Volker Greimann: Wolf-Ulrich Knoben is next.

Jonathan Robinson: You were the only one who wasn't able to provide substantive feedback where?

Thomas Rickert: When we are our CCWG working group meeting this morning. We asked the representatives of the various groups to feedback as to what the feedback of their groups were. And ASO, ccNSO and other groups, ALAC, they have provided substantive feedback to the progress that we've made. And I could only report that I provided an update.

And my question to this group is whether we plan or whether it's desired for the GNSO to inject status quo message in terms of feedback to the - to groups or whether we leave that entirely to the different - the constituencies.

Jonathan Robinson: Marika.

Marika Konings: Can I just ask everyone to speak very closely to the microphones? Even though we may hear it well in the room remote participants can't hear it very well unless you speak very closely to the mics.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so it's Jonathan. Speak closely and clearly with the mic. Now, Thomas, I think we might come back to this point in the sense that we had previously talked about sending some - if this is an answer to your question let me know, we had previously talked about the Council issuing some form of statement in support of the work of those groups. Are you referring to that? Or something else? I'm not 100% clear what - what do you want? What's the outcome of your question that you'd like to have?

Thomas Rickert: It can be a statement, it can also be, you know, points on substance rather than just applauding the groups for what they did or other types of general statements. It's quite open. But in retrospect when we - when the question is what do we feel how this week went, right? I think that we could have done more work on substance with respect to both groups and how we would give feedback rather than just doing updates.

Jonathan Robinson: When you say "we" do you refer to the GNSO Council?

Thomas Rickert: Correct.

Jonathan Robinson: And does anyone else think that that's the GNSO Council's role to provide that substantive feedback to those groups?

Thomas Rickert: That was my question whether - this is why I opened this up. I asked whether it's a desired outcome for the GNSO to speak to this or whether we want to leave it to the stakeholder groups or the constituencies. But, you know, I've just made the observation that other groups had provided interim but substantive feedback and we didn't.

Jonathan Robinson: Any responses to Thomas's point?

Yoav Keren: Just wanted to say that I share the same view.

Jonathan Robinson: Sure, I understand the view. It's a question as to whether or not the Council - as I understand it whether or not the Council should be putting substantive input into the work of the CWG or the CCWG. Is that the question, Thomas?

Yoav Keren: My view is that we have 21 people in the Council that are very good people and we're spending this many times we're spending 90% of our time talking about the procedures and not about the substance of things. And I think we should do more of what is important. But unfortunately there's also a structure problem I think in - right now in how the GNSO functions. But generally I think we can choose to work a little different.

Jonathan Robinson: Volker, are you responding to this point?

Volker Greimann: Yes, Volker Greimann speaking. I think it's not necessarily the role of the GNSO Council as the coordinating body of the GNSO to provide that feedback. However, I think it's our role to collect that feedback from our stakeholder groups and constituencies, i.e. on the Council level we should ask the councilors or require the councilors to go back to their constituencies and get the collected feedback from the constituencies and bring it back to the Council so that as the Council we may either analyze and distill a common view or at least provide an overview of the different positions that the stakeholder groups and constituencies have.

So while I do not agree that it is our role to make the position of the GNSO it is our - it is very much our role to showcase that position, i.e. collect and display.

Yoav Keren: Just to clarify, I didn't - if it was interpreted as our own view it was, for me, clear that anyone here as a councilor should represent the positions of their stakeholders and not their own personal.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Yoav. Amr and then Tony.

Amr Elsadr: Yeah, thanks. This is Amr. My understanding is that, well, the members appointed by every stakeholder group on each of the CWG and CCWG have provided a direct link between those stakeholder groups and those two groups. So I'm not sure why the Council needs to sort of add a layer of communication or representation. I can't foresee a situation where that would become necessary. But there may be something I'm missing, I'm not sure.

Jonathan Robinson: Can you please make sure you speak close to the microphone and of course identify yourself?

Amr Elsadr: Yes, sorry, I was complaining I couldn't hear you and Thomas earlier so sorry if I'm doing the same thing. I was just saying that - this is Amr - and I was just saying that my - I mean, the members of the CWG and CCWG appointed by the stakeholder groups of the GNSO provide a direct link between those stakeholder groups and the two respective cross community working groups.

So I'm not sure I can foresee a situation where it would become necessary for the GNSO Council to add an additional layer of communication or representation between those stakeholder groups and the cross community working groups.

If there is something I'm missing that's entirely possible. But as is right now I think those members, I mean, the members appointed with voting rights on the CWG as well as the participants, actually, they have - they're perfectly capable of representing and drafting any positions their stakeholder groups have and communicating them so.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, James, I think you wanted to come in next.

James Bladel: Yes, thanks. Yes, thanks, Jonathan. James speaking. And I think along the same lines of Amr's contribution I'm also a member of the CCWG Accountability and I would just note that the GNSO participants were very active in today's session and in previous sessions.

Perhaps we could - to Thomas's point perhaps we could do a better job of synthesizing or harmonizing our feedback at the outset so that when he is asked to present on behalf of the GNSO he can perhaps, you know, stitch something together that makes a little bit more sense as a comprehensive picture of feedback.

But I think generally, to Amr's point, you know, there is that - there is that desire to eliminate that middle layer of the Council itself and say to have - we're very well represented and I think the diverse and - diverse spectrum of views, if you will, that constitute the GNSO, from IPC and Registries and Registrars and NCUC, are all - we're all there and we're very much in the room.

So I don't think we were suffering from a lack of input from GNSO interests, I just think, to Thomas's point, when we went to each of the communities the GNSO was more of a yes we are on this and we are engaged and we are talking about this very vigorously amongst our constituencies.

Jonathan Robinson: So I've got a last point on - last response on this point which is from Phil.

Phil Corwin: Thank you. Phil Corwin for the record. Adding to what's already been said, you know, my understanding is that at some point when there's a plan before it goes to the Board we're going to be asked for a consensus view. I think we might want to think about trying to reach some rough consensus before that point. But right now it's just too early in the process. The work is too preliminary. It's too much of a moving target to even attempt for this group to reach a consensus deal on something that's changing every week.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. So as you know, what I've tried to do certainly with respect to the CWG is encourage councilors to supplement the work of the members of the group by making sure that active discussion and knowledge of the work of the CWG and to that extent also the CCWG, such that, as Phil says, when it comes to the Council later, we are - we know we've got well informed stakeholder groups and constituencies.

My understanding of the role of the Council in general is to act as policy manager and to guide and ensure that the policy function is being carried out effectively in the GNSO. But it's rare and under specific circumstances that we should be opining or giving a collective Council view on the view of the GNSO.

Separate to that, though, and kind of related, was a previous open action where Tony and Avri, were going to come together and make some work on a statement with the Council's support for the work of the CCWG and CWG. Now in one sense that opportunity has passed but in another you might feel that on the back of what's gone on in - with those two groups in Singapore that it does make sense.

That's probably my view to guide the thinking that - but please respond to that point. And I know there are some others who wanted to speak as well. I hope we haven't passed over anyone. I think Thomas set a ball rolling and we're responding to that. And there were some others who wanted to speak generally I think in review of ICANN meetings so we will come back to them.

Volker's got Wolf-Ulrich. But anyway, let's respond to that question: Should we be putting out some form of statement in relation to CWG and CCWG? Avri was first then Stephanie.

Avri Doria: Thanks. Avri Doria. First of all I want to apologize for having totally forgotten about doing that statement, which I had said I would do. Second, I think it's probably a good idea, and I volunteer, to work on it again and this time I pray that I do not forget.

Volker Greimann: Thank you, Avri. Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks very much. Stephanie Perrin for the record. In the spirit of trying to avoid unnecessary duplication of the enormous workload that we already have, it seems to me that if the Council is going to respond it has to be with a different lens, possibly in the context of the other work that we are doing.

I don't know that that lens is partly because I'm a newbie and I'm not just sure what value add we add to this difference. But I don't see any merit in just collecting up the same things that we're already feeding through our respective stakeholder groups. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Tony next.

Tony Holmes: Thanks, Jonathan. I was going to make the same point. I think one of the reasons maybe it did fall off our agendas was because of that particular doubts. And I certainly had that doubt later having seen what occurred whether there was value add.

That said, if it's the - excuse me, if it's the Council's desire to still go ahead with that then I'm quite happy to pick up going and work with Avri on that point. But I think the value add question is very valid.

Jonathan Robinson: So the BC I think pushed us quite hard on this previously with respect to a set of comments on - I forget the issue was relatively recently and said to the extent that the Council responded the Council should only respond in the reply period. And I quite like that mechanic. I think that seemed to work quite well.

So we heard what all the stakeholder groups and constituencies did. And to the extent that we then felt it relevant in that particular public comment period, in this instance, we are both - we are a chartering organization of two very critical groups.

So in my opinion, and those groups - there are different views as to the success or not of those groups, the effectiveness or not. So I think a statement not on the substance of the work of the group or not necessarily on the detail of it but highlighting, you know, maybe some satisfaction with progress, some recognition of the work being done which certainly has value.

Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: You stole my thunder basically. You know, I feel very, very conscious when it came to items for the Council to discuss, given the fact that we're just the steward of the policy process. But if you look at the GAC communiqué, if you look at statements that are coming out of ALAC as well as the ASO, it's basically given the whole community, as well as the outside world, assurance that we're moving in the right direction.

And I think that has impact. Even though there might not be significant substance in such statement, it shows that, you know, we are likely not to experience very bad surprises by a group completely refusing to support the outcome.

Certainly that's not a final nor a binding statement but I think it just reassures the groups of what they're doing is sort of correct and has the support of their respective subgroups.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, but we must be careful here because any statement should be sensitive to the diversity of views that still exist in both groups. So we can't presume homogeneity of viewpoints but nevertheless - so to my mind I think we're pretty much back where we were.

And if Tony and Avri are still willing, can we have a confirmation of willingness - I think you did give a confirmation of willingness to - I mean, it needn't' be long. I think this is a relatively brief and soon statement that just has a sign-off from the Council, you know, probably expressing thanks and recognition of their work and confidence that it's going in the right direction or something along those lines from a kind of management point of view.

Anyone have any resistance or objection to going down that road? Phil.

Phil Corwin: I have no objection. I would hope that we would add support, for example, where the groups have asked for ICANN assistance in obtaining proper legal advice, that we also support those efforts and urge ICANN to comply with them.

Jonathan Robinson: Wolf-Ulrich.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: I don't have any objection. The community was the one who was standing up or who was standing up last year and saying we would like to have this process running this way as it is right now coming down with those two coordination groups.

Maybe we should make a reference to that statement we have made altogether in term of last year about that and so - and along that side also to

make a point whether we are satisfied with this process as it goes at the time being.

Volker Greimann: Volker Greimann speaking. Just as a response, clarification question to Phil, when you say legal - obtaining legal advice what you mean outside legal advice outside the usual legal advice, i.e. Jones Day or would you say that that would be sufficient?

Phil Corwin: Phil Corwin for the record. I'm not sure what you mean by referring the usual legal advice. What I'm referring to is request by the two groups for the financial resources to retain outside objective legal advice particularly on the question of the - how California nonprofit public benefit corporation law affects the availability of accountability mechanisms.

So if the usual legal advice would be from ICANN legal I think we're looking for some - an outside opinion and we've already gotten the Jones Day memo this week which represents ICANN's view on the legalities.

Volker Greimann: I'm just informed by a member of the group that they are already obtaining outside legal review that is not the usual ICANN position. And there has been a commitment to fund it as well.

Chuck Gomes: Chuck Gomes jumping into the Council discussion here. I think the most important role the Council can play in both of these processes is to figure out how you - especially once we get to a point where there's enough substance to be able to do this. I realize - and I think Phil's point is right - that we're not quite there yet.

But to the extent that the Council and the councilors, in particular, can facilitate the information flow once it's getting down to some substance and make sure that in your respective groups that that information is flowing and you're getting the feedback that will really be a crucial factor, and I know both Thomas and Jonathan know this, in terms of being able to turn around an

approval or disapproval in the 21 day period that is targeted right now for that in the May June timeframe.

Jonathan Robinson: Tony.

Tony Holmes: Just to clarify is there an assumption from that that the Council will also be approving or giving a comment at that stage rather than the individual stakeholders?

Chuck Gomes: It looks like we're going to give difference answers and that's okay.

Jonathan Robinson: Chuck, go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, but - yes, I mean, the GNSO is a chartering organization and so there will need to be GNSO approval. And as the policy management body the GNSO Council is going to - responsible for determining that position.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, absolutely. I mean, I would - I mean, the proposals from both groups, CCWG and CWG, will come back to the GNSO Council. I think that's - we would expect that to be the case. And there will be a Council vote on whether or not to approve those which is why we're so keen in both cases the councilors in addition to the members make their groups aware of the work going on.

So in a sense, I guess my view of the Council's role in all of this is as both managers but if you like almost shepherds and just maintaining that liaison, that connection, that awareness that this work is going on and ensuring that your groups are dealing with this - these two substantial pieces of work coming down the pipeline.

Chuck Gomes: And just to go a little bit further - and I think everybody understands this but let me say it anyway, 21 days is not a usual period for the Council to make a decision. It doesn't allow for a deferred motion, for example. And that's why

it's so critical that there's lots of preparation and lots of communication, lots of feedback received before we ever get to that 21 day period so that each of you as councilors that will be casting a vote in terms of a motion to approve have, you know, we don't want to violate the multistakeholder bottom up process but to make it work in this case because of the timeframe you're going to have to get a lot of that well in advance of the actual time when there's a motion.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah and just to really run that point home, I mean, the - Chuck picked up on one key technical point and that is there is an opportunity whenever a motion is before the Council for a councilor, on behalf of their group, to request a deferral to the next Council meeting. The principle behind that deferral is to accommodate further discussion in the event that there has been insufficient discussion in any given group.

The discretion to approve that deferral sits with the chair, normally not withheld. So the thing we might want to think about is whether, you know, I mean, I'm certainly thinking about it and, you know, would be whether I would withhold any request for a deferral in that case because we've done so much work to make sure that everyone is adequately prepared for this particular important and timely motion coming down the track. So that's the dynamic that we're kind of anticipating.

I've got a response from Tony and Thomas.

Tony Holmes: Well just to add to that, Jonathan, I agree with what you say. I mean, it is beholden on us to make sure that the channels are open and we're bringing our communities along with the discussion. One of the potential flaws in this would be that if we reach a stage on a very tight Council schedule where the motion itself is substantially changed then we would have to go back to our communities.

Jonathan Robinson: Understood. Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: But I think given all we've heard so far it might even have more value to have these statements because I think, you know, if the draft statement goes to the respective groups that will also give the groups the head up that they need to more closely monitor the whole process, right? So I think, you know, having statements plus - leading - segueing into the approval I think could be a choreography on how the GNSO and the Council is going to deal with this.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, so that's very helpful. So let's, I mean, this has been a little bit of a hijack but a valuable one on Item 1 which is review of the ICANN 52 and related items.

I think what we've heard is the essence of what was previously proposed - but Thomas makes a really good point that a third or additional point that might go in that communication is a point to - directed at the stakeholder groups and constituencies to keep track of the work. And the Council encourages GNSO stakeholder groups and constituencies to keep a very close eye on the work so that they are in a position to make a timely evaluation of whether or not to approve the proposal at the time of the proposal being made. Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, and just to follow up on what Thomas suggested, because it struck an interesting idea in my mind and that is to the extent that elements of the proposals could be at least somewhat isolated statements on those elements of support could be very helpful so that when you get up to a complete proposal - and you obviously have to look at the whole - but still if there have been approvals whether formal or not, of support for the particular elements leading up to that, that'll make the whole package easier to do. So I think your idea has some real merit along that line too. And I'll get away from the table now.

Jonathan Robinson: All right. Let's close that sub topic of - any other feedback or related points? And just mind you that that survey will be coming out and it will be

very good to get your feedback. And it would be normal in terms of our rotation, I mean, Volker - and, thank you, Volker - did some good work with Marika and Glen. Thank you Marika and Glen for planning this - in the planning of this meeting.

It would be normal for that to switch to you, David. Are you okay with that - with being the lead on the Buenos Aires meeting?

David Cake: Yeah, totally fine.

Jonathan Robinson: Volker, go ahead.

Volker Greimann: Yeah, especially thanks to Glen. You were invaluable in planning this meeting. I wouldn't have been able to do anything with you. One point I would like to raise, though while we had very successful meetings with the GDD, with Fadi and Theresa, I was a bit taken aback by the lack of interest in these topics leading up to the meeting when it asked the councilors to provide topics to discuss.

While it is possible to have - to discuss these at the day prior to the meeting, having these topics earlier allows - if only the simple courtesy of treating our guests to the questions that they are allowed to prepare better.

I'm sure (unintelligible) has interests and ideas of what they would like to see discussed during those meetings, and responding to a simple inquiry of what you would like to see discussed during those meetings would be a great help in organizing these meetings as well.

I'm not sure whether this is the right point in time to say this but I've really taken Tony's comment that kicked this off, to heart and to give this a little bit more thinking. I think the notion of giving presentations up front and then limit ourselves to substantive discussions when the chairs, vice chairs or rapporteurs, whatever, go to the various groups is a very good one.

So how can you achieve that? You could, for example, record those presentations, make them available on YouTube or whatever platform it might be. Because there have been concerns that, you know, due to different arrival times people might not get the initial story.

So my suggestion would be there must be an inventory of the initial presentation somewhere online so people can get themselves up to speed and then it can be expected that everybody can have a substantive discussion when the representatives are in the room.

Marika Konings: So this is Marika. So some of the things we've already been doing in that area, you know, I think as you all know we hold the policy update webinar usually a week before the meeting which already covers some topics. We have the policy briefings that we typically also provide a week before the meeting to try to, you know, gear people up in preparation for the sessions.

I think - and I'm hoping that is working that we've asked all the working group chairs to focus their presentations on the substance, move all, you know, background information, you know, what's in the charter, what did they do before, to an annex so they have it available should the Council want to discuss it.

But the focus has to be - or that's what encouraged to be on, you know, what is the substance, where they're at, what are they looking for the Council. So if you still think that is not working as it should be, yes we can definitely look at, you know, presentations or webinar ahead of time. My concern is just, you know, will people have time to do that?

Because usually as well we do prepare, for example, the briefing materials relatively close to the meeting so we really have the latest information available as a lot of people work up to, you know, the deadlines.

But if you have any other ideas or suggestions on how we can ensure further the preparation and maybe also to note again that we now have as well a dedicated, you know, one stop shop for any GNSO meeting related information which will hopefully also help preparations in advance. But of course if you have any other suggestions we more than happily hear them.

Volker Greimann: Thank you, Marika. Next is Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much. Cheryl Langdon-Orr. And I'm doing the caring and sharing that I'm supposed to do ALAC liaison. This is a very similar conversation to what's happening in ALAC rooms as well, the stop giving us the same things we could have read beforehand.

But there's a couple of points that we've had and we are doing a lot of archiving and webinars and outreach and capacity building for these meetings. As I'm sure is not the case in this room, I fear it has been shown to be the case within at least the 15-person ALAC that not everybody does in fact go over the materials in advance. And substantive discussions are limited and so frequently go back to some of the 101 materials.

So perhaps a hybrid - of course this would never happen in this room but sadly it does happen in the other room - and with that said, perhaps a hybrid where there is very key points to make sure the embarrassment of someone clearly not having done their homework being discovered during the discussion, perhaps those key points can be brought up at the beginning and perhaps less time spent on the very long presentations. Thank you.

Volker Greimann: Stephanie then Tony.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks. Stephanie Perrin for the record. And I don't want to indulge myself in one of my frequent lateral thinking excursions. But following up on what Cheryl was saying, I do want to know what the (unintelligible) and the metrics are for how we measure what we're doing with the Board.

I, for one, if I've read the documents and done my research as best I can on the ICANN Website, sorry for bringing it up again, like burdening staff to produce more PowerPoints, I don't think that's productive.

And I don't want to see another one, you know, frankly. I'd rather have a good conversation. But maybe I'm out of line. I mean, I think we spend so much time briefing on stuff over and over and over again, we need new thinking, don't we? And if we could have a conversation that would spur new thinking I think that would be more useful. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Could I just clarify, Stephanie, so are you saying that we've got too much as it is? Or are you reacting to a suggestion that we have more at the next meeting?

Stephanie Perrin: (Unintelligible) I beg our pardon. Stephanie again. I'm going to back to Thomas's bringing up the same presentation over and over again. I think we do have too much now. There is quite a bit of repetition. It all starts to look the same.

And how you manage that so that we all get briefed on Thomas's stuff - I hate to pick on him but, you know, he's right beside me - once so that he doesn't have to do it five times, you know, let's - when we're looking at the meeting revisions let's figure out how to make maximum use of people's times and then not to do it them - because I think after four hectic days started at 7:00 in the morning or - and, you know, up all night reading documents, this is, you know, I'm at this point, I don't know about you. And I don't think that leads to good creative thinking.

Volker Greimann: Tony.

Tony Holmes: Thanks. Tony Holmes. For the record I did express in the meeting earlier my frustration with sitting through repetitive presentations, as excellent as they

were. But particularly excellent from yours, Thomas. But when I made that point it was in no way a criticism of the GNSO because the GNSO can't solve that problem. And I think the way we tend to work is pretty slick.

I know that some people from my constituency they do value those first two days. They never used to come at one time; they do come now. One of the reasons they come is because they get that update.

But this is a broader question and the repetitiveness, for me, didn't really come from within GNSO discussions, it came from when I went further into the discussions across the week in various groups.

So it's a problem that if it's going to get addressed it needs to get addressed for everyone. And I think there is an opportunity maybe to look at this now because one of the things that came out of our Council meeting earlier this week was an action to start looking at the new arrangements for meeting.

I think we can feed some of that input back through that process. But if we can structure the ICANN meetings in general so that presentations are - maybe given once and then repeated by YouTube or whatever, we save a lot of time and we can spend the rest of that time having the discussion which very often, now, is little more than half of those sessions. And they need to be improved.

Volker Greimann: Thank you, Tony. We need to close the queue that we still have which myself and Thomas, because we need to move on. Moving on to my statement, Volker Greimann speaking. Tony's absolutely right; the presentations at the GNSO level aren't the problem. The problem in the quotation marks, is that these presentations are not only held at the GNSO but then held when the working group meetings, then held again when the stakeholder groups meet.

So the potential - the usual potential of any one councilor here is to hear when he's also participating in the working group, for example, to hear the

presentation at least three times, maybe with different - different points highlighted, however, it's usually the same presentation. It's worse if you're the one holding the presentation because then you have to hold it for the GNSO, for the different stakeholder groups, for the working group, for the Board, for the GAC and so on and so on and so on.

That is, I think, something that we should look at eliminating by having the presentation taped once and presented by YouTube or - and any other means for anyone to access and then held once again at the Council level which is where it's supposed to be held which is - that's at least my basic input on this.

Thomas, you wanted to have last word?

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so - it's - I mean, there's an essential point here that this is in part a meeting scheduling issue so I guess what we're asking as an action is that we pass onto the meeting schedule team an awareness of GNSO weekend sessions as well as a detail of the GNSO weekend sessions in their overall view so that's an action.

I'm going to move us quickly through the rest. We've taken 45 minutes to get here. We were going to try and do a quick meeting. But so we've got - the next point, rather logically is the meeting strategy implementation drafting team, is it - DT - is that correct? It's a drafting team? Okay, yeah.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I don't think we've officially called it a drafting team but my understanding was that they would be drafting a kind of proposal for the Council to look at in relation to GNSO meetings at the - especially I think the B meeting going forward. So as we are - I think we're trying to standardize on terms we're using I thought drafting team might be the...

Jonathan Robinson: Sorry, I mean, there's a meeting - there's the implementation - we had a presentation from Nick Tomasso and Tanzanica and so I thought you were

referring to that. I now understand this is the meeting strategy implementation drafting team of the Council.

And so the objective of this group is to respond to the new meeting structure which mostly is a response to Meeting B, and plan for how the GNSO might handle those meetings. And this is specifically the GNSO; this isn't just the Council. It's to deal with both the Council and work with the stakeholder groups and constituencies to understand how they want to work. So it's going to be some kind of iterative engagement and that's the function of this group.

So we've got Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. And to add to that as I think the - especially the B meeting also focuses on intra-community work it probably at some point would also involve conversations with the other SO and AC chairs because I'm assuming that it may include, you know, meetings with the ccNSO Council, a meeting with the GAC.

So I think we - at some point will need to have that coordination as well to make sure that if, you know, we pick Day 2 as joint meetings they haven't picked Day 4.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay got it, Marika. So what we want there, please, is then if we can capture that action item, Marika, am I looking at you? So there's three points in there, there's the role of the Council, the role of the stakeholder groups and constituencies, role and function, and role and function of other SO and ACs in the new meeting structure. And that is the scope of this drafting team. And that's the work that they need to do.

And I guess they need to do that and conclude that work before calendar year '16 is my understanding. Come to be advance of calendar year '16. Does anyone want to, at this point, put up their hand to join Tony, Bret,

James and Volker? And is there a sort of group leader? Is there a drafting - Heather, you'd like to join the group? Go ahead.

Heather Forrest: Thank you. Thank you, Jonathan. Heather Forrest. May I suggest, if I put forward a suggestion here, given the (unintelligible) of what you've said the need to involve the separate SGs and constituencies, that the drafting team be comprised of a member or representative of each of those if that doesn't make it too unwieldy that ensure that we have the information going back to the Cs and SGs. Regardless of whether that suggestion is an acceptable one to Council, I'm happy to put my hand up to participate in the group.

Jonathan Robinson: Great. Okay so that's a sensible suggestion. Thank you for offering to help there. Let's move on. CWG on Country and Territory Names as TLDs, we need a liaison. We had Gabriella Szlak as a liaison and we do not have her. Cheryl is asking, A, is there a reason why she can't do that? And, B, is there anyone else who's particularly interested in doing that anyway? Marika.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. The only limitation there may be - but I'm sure others would be willing to help with that are usually the Council liaison also serves in the capacity of when an issue needs to be brought forward in the form of a motion that they submit the motion. But, again, I think that is someone - where someone else could work with Cheryl in that case.

Jonathan Robinson: Heather.

Heather Forrest: Thank you, Jonathan. Heather Forrest. The only reason I look confused is we voted on this at the Council in LA and confirmed Carlos as the Council liaison.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you, Heather. It's just that Marika wasn't concentrating then.

Volker Greimann: Marika is raising hers vigorously so I think we'd let her in.

Marika Konings: Yes because I actually believe that we had Carlos as the co-chair, not as the liaison. No?

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: He's, I believe, the co-chair together with you as on the CC side they also have two co-chairs.

Carlos Gutierrez: Yes, that's the confusion.

((Crosstalk))

Heather Forrest: This is...

Jonathan Robinson: Please talk in order and talk to the microphone. Go ahead, Heather.

Heather Forrest: Apologies, Jonathan. This is Heather. I'll go back and look at my own notes from LA. I don't mean to suggest Marika is the last person in this entire conference center, I would suggest has made a mistake. But I'm relatively sure only because I'm involved in this, I'm relatively sure that it was approached to me as Council liaison and we specifically noted the absence of Gabriela. In any event before we reach a decision let's go back and look at, for sure, what we did in LA. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Fine. Let's retain the item as open and if it is already resolved great, if not we'll tidy it up at the next meeting. Moving us on then, I'm going to skip over this Item 4 and we'll come back to that if we have time. Can we have the next slide please, Lars?

There's a proposal for a facilitated - well there is funding for a facilitated face to face working group meeting as part of a pilot series of meetings in Buenos Aires. So (unintelligible) we verify that means the members of the working

group get - obtain travel funding to be at the meeting? What does it actually mean?

Marika Konings: No, this is Marika. So what the pilot involves is that funding is available for one or potentially two additional hotel nights so to stay either an additional day before or after the meeting, depending on how it's scheduled, for working group members to participate in that effort.

And the way it is set up or the structure is that I think it's - each stakeholder group can select or appoint up to six active working group members from their respective groups to participate in that effort. So in the last meeting we had the Privacy Proxy Working Group; this meeting it's the IGO INGO Curative Rights Working Group. And what staff would like to suggest is that for the next meeting it would be, again, the Privacy and Proxy PDP Working Group.

And I think it's - looking at Mary I don't know if we had a chance to already check this with the chairs to see if that also aligns with their thinking. Because our - staff's current thinking is that the initial report is likely to get published not too long after this meeting or that's at least the desire, which would line the Buenos Aires meeting up nicely for them to, you know, review, discuss, you know, assess public comments and hopefully also be in a position to, you know, come to some kind of agreement on what the final report may look like.

So that is at least from the staff side the current suggestion. I don't know if anyone has any concerns or objection about that.. As we've said, you know, our idea would be to maybe come back with a, you know, final confirmation on that by the next Council meeting as we hope that by that date we'll have a clearer view whether that timeline is indeed, you know, realistic and will line up or, you know, at that time we may still be able then to recommend another group if we think that they're not going to make it and it won't be productive. But that's where we're at.

Jonathan Robinson: The proposal is provisionally for this PPSAI group to meet, Privacy Proxy group to meet face to face. Any concerns or objections to that subject to that group being in a position to take full advantage of it? Any - Susan and then Volker.

Susan Kawaguchi: So I was curious - I am on that - this is Susan speaking, by the way - I am on that working group. And it may be a good advantage to have the working group together to discuss. But I was wondering are there any other working groups that were also good candidates so that we can weigh the benefits?

Jonathan Robinson: Would you like to respond to - I mean, it sounds like you had a rationale basis for why you proposed that one, Marika, the staff proposal was for that one.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. So basically this pilot is focused on PDP working groups so the active working groups that we currently have is the Translation and Transliteration. They I think anticipate to have a final report before Buenos Aires so it wouldn't make any sense for them to have a face to face.

And then we also have the IGO INGO Curative Rights and they actually have a face to face meeting here. And I think our anticipation is that they will take a little bit longer to have an initial report that would then get them much closer to the Buenos Aires meeting or even through that depending on when they're able to publish that. So that would make I think Privacy Proxy the more likely candidate at this stage. But I think Phil is in the queue so he may be able to comment on...

Volker Greimann: Yes, the queue - in response to this question of whether there are other working groups is Phil, Heather and then James.

Phil Corwin: Thanks. Phil Corwin for the record. I'm a member of both working groups; I'm co-chair of the Curative Rights Process for IGOs and we're having a full face

to face tomorrow. It's hard - I have no objection to the PPSAI going again if that makes sense.

In terms of whether this is a useful exercise, the daylong meeting in LA of the PPSAI got a lot done but it was hard to judge the role of the facilitator because our facilitator disappeared after the first hour with food poisoning. So we couldn't really test it out. While we're hoping that our facilitator tomorrow is very careful about what he's eating today and for breakfast tomorrow.

And so far as the timetable for the IGO group, we hope to have at least a preliminary report ready close to the time of Buenos Aires but it's hard to know right now; a lot depends on how much we get done tomorrow if we're able to dispose of one major issue and move on to the last one.

Volker Greimann: Thank you, Phil. Heather.

Heather Forrest: Thank you. Heather Forrest. We have a team working on PPSAI related issues in the IPC and are working on this today and in the coming days. And if it's at all possible that a decision as to which PDP is selected could be put to the next Council meeting, delayed to the next Council meeting that would be very helpful for our ongoing work. Thank you.

Volker Greimann: Thank you, Heather. James.

James Bladel: I heard no from Marika...

Volker Greimann: Yes, James, go ahead.

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: ...and I always stop when Marika - okay so James speaking for the transcript. It sounds like - and I think this is kind of what maybe Phil was getting at and probably have a little bit more experience after the session tomorrow - but I

thought that the LA session was good. I thought Thomas did an excellent job as our substitute teacher when the facilitator developed his food poisoning.

I just think that perhaps if the PPSAI group is working between - somewhere between initial report and final report and assessing public comments and if the IGO INGO group is driving towards initial report it seems like it might be more efficient use of that extra day to have IGO NGO go two ICANN meetings in a row with that facilitated face-to-face meeting just to kind of keep things moving along.

And, you know, whereas something as close to the finish line may not benefit or see the same value that another group that's just getting started might. So I'm just putting that out there. And I guess really if there's anyone at the table who's going to be able to make an informed and educated opinion on which of those is true would be Phil sometime tomorrow.

Volker Greimann: Mary was next.

Mary Wong: Thanks, Volker. So I'm speaking as one of the staff support to both working groups, and following on what Marika has said. At the moment, and of course there are some dependencies, it would seem, as what James has said, that we hope that PPSAI will be in the process of reviewing public comments and prepping its final report around the time of Buenos Aires.

                  The work plan for the IGO Curative Rights group, at the moment, is the aim of publishing its initial report just before Buenos Aires. So if these timelines hold then it makes sense, from the staff perspective to have the PPSAI group at least initially and preliminarily selected subject to confirmation on 19 March, we will have all this additional information.

                  And of course the other dependency, Jonathan and Volker is, you know, if anybody needs travel support and the deadline for sending nominations,

etcetera, etcetera. So from that staff perspective we would rather at least have one tentative group then have none between now and March.

Volker Greimann: Thank you, Mary. Just one final statement from me, Volker for the record, last time the announcement of this meeting came at a very late stage which meant that some councilors, some working group members, including myself, had already finalized travel plans and it was very problematic to change them. So making this decision now or very soon to this date would prevent such troubles from occurring at the next meeting.

Marika.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Just for the record, that meeting was also confirmed at the wrap up. I think we've been trying to do that for each of the face-to-face we've had so far that we tried to get a confirmation or at least sense from the Council that, you know, they're happy to move forward with it. And then we communicate that as well as quickly as possible to the different groups as we, you know, fully appreciate that travel plans need to be made and it does mean, you know, seeing an additional day at an ICANN meeting.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so my understanding is provisionally we move forward with PPSAI, subject to further detail checking. And we can confirm this at the next Council meeting. It happens that there is a more substantial break between - in time between this meeting and Buenos Aires then there was between the last two meetings. So I think there is a bit of room to move here and let's get it sorted out on or before the next Council meeting - at or before the next Council meeting.

New gTLD discussion group, I think - I'd like to pass over this given that Bret isn't here and he's instrumental in that group. It's something will have to pick up in the next Council meeting.

On I to 7, which was to confirm the action or the way forward for that CWG on auction proceeds, this is an interesting one, I mean, it feels timely to do this but there were concerns that it wasn't timely from the point of view of resourcing.

My thought on that is it's better to put a smaller stake in the ground and start slowly then do nothing at all. So that's my kind of - but I would like to make sure we check that week you. And the start - to be clear what the "start slowly" means is send the letter to the other SOs and ACs looking for an expression of interest to co-charter a group to deal with auction proceeds. Volker.

Volker Greimann: I fully agree, this should be kicked off as soon as possible. Ideally we would be done with this once the big snowball that is the data repository Whois services start rolling down the hill so we're done by that time. This next big project comes along so we have no more big projects or many projects in the pipeline at that time.

Phil.

Phil Corwin: Yeah, I thought I should chime in since I raised some concerns yesterday and conveyed the BC view. I don't think we have - I can see the virtue of at least initiating a process to start the process to show that the community wants to be very involved with this so the Board doesn't include don't care and do their own thing.

But again, reflecting the BC concerns, I would hope that we do this very deliberately and not rush to a conclusion particularly since the program is still running out and we have no idea what the total amount of auction proceeds I is going to be.

Susan Kawaguchi: There's eight reviews that need to be started either, you know, the AOC review or other - this is Susan. So those eight reviews for 2015 so - and then

the EWG Whois snowball, as you named that. So, you know, we can put a stake in the ground but I would hate to really move forward fast and not give this the attention that it should have.

Volker Greimann: Wolf-Ulrich go ahead.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yeah, Wolf-Ulrich speaking. This morning in the finance session I heard a figure about of $33 million up to now in the fund - the proceeds to fund. I think what ICANN is now doing is just putting it on hold and trying, well, to get interest of it.

I would say that is not enough. And if it increases - so and usually as we have in each time to establish a group to talk about that from this community we should immediately start with that. That's my opinion.

Volker Greimann: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich although the current economic situation, the interest that will be gathered over the time will probably be very, very low. Avri, you're next.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Avri Doria. I just want to make sure that in delaying this we're not basically telling the Board, go ahead and do what you think needs to be done.

Jonathan Robinson: So in my view, Avri, on the contrary the purpose of not delaying it is specifically to achieve that effect. But nevertheless - so we do not propose to delay it, in my view; we propose to commission it and take it off but deliberately and at a reasonable pace given the spread of resources and everything else, in particular in and around the transition I think. Okay, done. We'll close that item then.

This next item is mostly a point of information but also an opportunity to see if there's something we're missing. I think we covered off these Council financial year '16 community financial requests but I'd like to ask Marika to

just give us the list of requests that are going to be submitted so you - and seek any comment or objection to those or any suggestions for supplements.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. So the current requests we are preparing our similar to the ones we submitted last time around so it's the GAC GNSO liaison to the GAC, so the travel funding to allow for the liaison to come to the ICANN meetings. That's one. That will be submitted jointly with the GAC.

Then the second one is the GNSO Council development session, so in continuation for that so that after the Dublin meeting there would be a possibility to have such a session.

And then thirdly, continuation of the facilitated face-to-face PDP working group meeting pilot project as we believe that we may need some more time to really assess whether it's bringing the benefits that we think it may bring to speeding up the PDP process and coming to consensus more easily. So I think that's all the ones we have on the list for the GNSO Council.

Jonathan Robinson: Any objections or concerns with items on that list and/or any items that councilors feel should be added to that given the time is probably quite tight, I'd imagine, for submission.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. The deadline I believe is 28 February so there's no intermediate Council meeting or anything. So if there are any concerns they better be flagged now, although I don't think there's anything preventing you from withdrawing should at some point you believe it's no longer applicable.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, to the extent that they were submitted last year at least they are routine. I don't see any concerns with those.

Okay any other business that anyone would like to raise? Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I just want to confirm we looked back that the minutes and transcripts so basically on the 13 of November of last year we reconfirmed our confirmed new liaisons and co-chairs to the different groups and Carlos was appointed as a co-chair to the CWG. And I believe Gabriella was already in place as the liaison to that group from an earlier date.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so in other words we might as well close this one off then and - because both Heather and Carlos are co-chairs we need an additional offer of a liaison to that group. And I believe we had an indication of interest from Cheryl. Yeah, but is anyone else?

Susan Kawaguchi: Sorry. I just sent you an email about the NGO INGO. I am the liaison but now that Phil is a councilor and he is the co-chair it makes sense that he perform that role so that - I'm assuming that can be changed.

Marika Konings: Yeah, and this is Marika. I actually responded to that because one reason why you may want to reconsider that is that I think under the PDP manual and the Working Group Guidelines the liaison also performs a function in those cases where there is a need to mediate conflict.

And, you know, if that conflict with the chair or where the chair has, for example, made a designation of consensus where people believe there wasn't then it's usually the liaison that assists in that process. So those two roles are in the same - held by the same person that could potentially be problematic.

Jonathan Robinson: No problem. No problem. I'm not sure I did fully before so so it looks like Wolf-Ulrich.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Just a comment and observation. It was a pleasure to me to step in again after a while to the Council here. I lost a little bit track in between. This ICANN meeting I managed only one meeting to join where the words "accountability" and "IANA transition" haven't been used.

I was of the opinion that this ICANN meeting and also the whole GNSO is just only focusing on the IANA stewardship and the accountability but I'm confident after meeting the Council again that there are other issues to be dealt with and that we take care about that. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich and thank you for your contribution. It's been great having you back albeit temporarily. I just want to close that previous item which I think is that we will accept Cheryl's offer recognizing that she is not in a position to make a motion should that be required. But we can work with staff and/or other councilors to achieve that. So we will appoint Cheryl as the liaison to that group.

And I'm just trying to think - struggling for the name - it's the CWG on Country Names and Territories? Thank you. Wonderful. Thank you, Cheryl.

Any other business? Obviously an opportunity to thank all of you for your active participation. Thank members of staff for their superb support as usual. And I think that probably covers it. There's - if anyone hasn't paid Mary and - for the dinner the other night, excluding me who normally gets an exemption from that sort of thing.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: If anyone hasn't paid Mary please make sure you deal with Glen or Mary in settling the bill. And there was a charger here - there's a Samsung charger. Has anyone lost a Samsung charger? Small white Samsung charger.

Glen de Saint Géry: It was left at the Council meeting yesterday. Does it belong to anybody? You?

Woman: And left near me. Someone ran after me thinking it was mine. So if you sat near me yesterday is it yours?

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, any other business? Any other points that anyone wanted to make or raise? Volker. Okay great, Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: I can't resist stating publicly that I'm very much appreciative and admire your workload being both chair of this group as well as of the CWG. And I hope that you can come to arrangements with both your co-chairs to share the workload or find volunteers in this group to help out. You're on two very important missions but I think we need to take the weight off your shoulders in the Council.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you, Thomas. I appreciate you recognizing that and I'm sure David and Volker will step up to help as necessary and other councilors.

David Cake: Very happy to take on some extra workload as you are clearly very busy. Yeah.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you, David. Thank you, Thomas. Thank you all of you. We'll call the meeting to a close now.

END